

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 5-23 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Sisselman in view of Kawamura.

Amended claim 1 calls for a controller to selectively save stored successive sequences of frames of predetermined duration as a first loop or a second loop in response to a user input.

Sisselman fails to disclose saving memory loops. For example, Sisselman's microprocessor sequentially addresses and stores or overwrites video in memory segments. [0033]. But, Sisselman does not provide the option of saving a memory segment after it has been written to. Saving a memory loop after storage may prevent the particular loop from being inadvertently overwritten should the user desire to keep that information available. As such, claim 1 is patentable over Sisselman in view of Kawamura.

Amended claim 14 recites recording a sequence of frames of predetermined duration as a first loop or a second loop, the predetermined duration user definable. Although Sisselman indicates that the memory in RAM may be broken up into different sized segments, Sisselman fails to disclose that the size of the segments are user-definable. As such, amended claim 14 is distinguished over Sisselman in view of Kawamura.

Pursuant to amended claim 19, a first loop is enabled to be overwritten without overwriting a second loop. Sisselman sequentially overwrites video in his memory segments. Thus, before an earlier memory segment is addressed for overwrite, the microprocessor addresses and writes to a later segment. In fact, where Sisselman breaks his memory loop, sequential recording continues. In contrast, as one example, in some embodiments of the present invention, a user may stop the recording to a loop. Thereafter, the user may depress the record button, which could immediately reinitialize the record software so that previously stored frames are overwritten with new frames.

Because Sisselman fails to disclose writing to a first loop without necessarily writing to a second loop, claim 19 is patentable over Sisselman in view of Kawamura.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 24, 2005

Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
PROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906

Attorneys for Intel Corporation